



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,767	01/04/2000.	DANIEL EDWARD HOUSE	ST999131/149	9705

7590 12/02/2003

SAWYER & ASSOCIATES
P O BOX 51418
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/477,767

Applicant(s)

HOUSE ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew Nalven

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 17 and 18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moriconi et al US Patent No. 6,158,010. Moriconi discloses a security system for a distributed computer network.
4. With regards to claim 1, Moriconi teaches a plurality of heterogeneous computer systems (column 4, lines 7-15) with at least two of the systems including a system specified user identification (column 6, lines 66-67). Moriconi further discloses an enterprise directory service shared by the plurality of computer systems (column 6, lines 4-6 and 15-27) for the formation of an enterprise group (column 6, line 64-66). The enterprise directory server includes at least one enterprise user associated with system specified user identifications (column 7, lines 42-56).

Art Unit: 2134

5. With regards to claim 2, Moriconi teaches the existence of an enterprise directory service adaptor at each computer system (column 6, lines 7-10).
6. With regards to claim 3, Moriconi teaches that the enterprise directory service adaptor maps between a system specified user ID and an enterprise user (column 7, lines 50-56).
7. With regards to claim 4, Moriconi teaches the enterprise directory comprising a container that has at least one enterprise user (column 6, lines 15-31 and 64-66).
8. With regards to claim 5, Moriconi teaches an enterprise administrator (column 11, lines 57-60 and column 12, lines 12-16) that can create an enterprise group and define users for the group (column 12, lines 35-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6-8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriconi et al US Patent No. 6,158,010 in view of Dutcher et al US Patent No. 6,269,405. Moriconi teaches a security system for a distributed computer network as described above.
10. With regards to claims 6 and 12, Moriconi's disclosure teaches a distributed network containing "very heterogeneous environments" (Moriconi, column 4, line 9).

Art Unit: 2134

Moriconi lacks a specific disclosure to different operating systems being employed on the various computer systems. Dutcher teaches a method of establishing user accounts at a central server. Dutcher's teaches a heterogeneous network composed of multiple operating platforms (Dutcher, column 2, line 63 – column 3, line 6). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Dutcher's multiple operating platform interoperability because it would allow communication's and updates between systems of different platforms without human intervention (Dutcher, column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 6).

11. With regards to claims 7 and 13, Moriconi as modified teaches the creation of a container that has at least one enterprise user (Moriconi, column 6, lines 15-31 and 64-66) by way of the creation of an administrator (Moriconi, column 11, lines 50-64).

12. With regards to claim 8, Moriconi as modified teaches the creation of an enterprise group and identities for the eDSAs (Moriconi, column 11 line 65 – column 12 line 5), the defining of enterprise users for the group (Moriconi, column 12, lines 35-39), and the creation of a container for the group comprising users (Moriconi, column 6, lines 15-31 and 64-66).

13. Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriconi et al US Patent No. 6,158,010 and Dutcher et al US Patent No. 6,269,405 as applied to claims 6 and 12 above, and further in view of Bunnell US Patent No.

6,192,405. Moriconi and Dutcher teach a system as described above. Moriconi and Dutcher lack disclosure of request and response steps. Bunnell discloses a first system

Art Unit: 2134

specified user identification on a first system invoking a request on a second system (Bunnell, column 8, lines 29-31 and 50-52). The request is serviced by the second specified user identification on a second computer system (Bunnell, column 8 line 50 – column 9 line 4). A result is returned from the second computer to the first (Bunnell, column 13, lines 15-25). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Bunnells request and response steps because they offer the advantage of simplifying resource access across multiple network connected systems (Bunnell, column 1, lines 30-50).

14. Claim 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriconi et al US Patent No. 6,158,010, Dutcher et al US Patent No. 6,269,405, and Bunnell US Patent No. 6,192,405 as applied to claims 9 and 14 above, and further in view of Teper et al US Patent No. 5,815,665. With regards to claims 10 and 15, Moriconi, Dutcher, and Bunnell, as described above, teach the invoking of a request from a first system specified user identification to be serviced on a second computer system (Bunnell, column 8, lines 29-31 and 50-52) and the determination by the first eDSA that the user is an enterprise user (Moriconi, column 13, lines 14-32 and column 7 line 25 – column 8 line 14) and the forwarding of the packaged request to the second computer system (Moriconi, column 8, lines 23-32 and Figure 13). Moriconi, Dutcher, and Bunnell fail to teach the packaging of the request as being invoked by an enterprise user. Teper teaches the packaging of a request as being invoked by at least one enterprise user (Teper, column 18, lines 39-67). At the time the invention was made, it

Art Unit: 2134

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Teper's request packaging method because it offers the advantage of authentication transparent to the user (Teper, column 19, lines 1-18).

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claims 17 and 18 are allowed.

16. Claims 11 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

17. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

18. With regards to claims 17 and 18, the cited prior art fails to teach the servicing of the packaged request by the second computer system as if invoked by the second system specified user identification in combination with the other claimed elements.

19. With regards to claims 11 and 16, the cited prior art fails to teach the receiving of the request from the first computer system by the second computer system with the request being packaged for the at least one enterprise user, the determining by the second eDSA that the at least one enterprise user is associated with the second system specified user identification for the second computer system, and servicing the request by the second computer system as if invoked by the second system specified user identification.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

21. Any inquiry regarding this communication from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Nalven at (703) 305-8407 during the hours of 7:15 AM – 4:45 PM Monday through Thursday. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

In the event that attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 308 – 4789.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:


(703) 872-9306 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9306 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 09/477,767

Page 8

Art Unit: 2134

Andrew Nalven

ALN